

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/633,098	08/04/2000	Seigo Shiraishi	2000-1072	2484
7590 08/11/2004		EXAMINER		
Wenderoth Lind & Ponack LLP			RAO, SHRINIVAS H	
2033 K Street NW Suite 800		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Washington, DC 20006			2814	
			DATE MAILED: 08/11/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/633,098	SHIRAISHI ET AL.				
·	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Steven H. Rao	2814				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 21 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) 🖾 they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
7.⊠ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)⊠ will not be entered or b)□ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>13-22</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
B. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. ☐ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>						

Continuation of 10. Other: Applicants' have cancelled all finally rejected claims 13-22 and attempted to replace them with new claims 23-30, however proposed independent claim 23 is of different scope than previous independent claim 22at least by the additional recitation in claim 23 of: "conductive polymer formed in the dielectric layer in lines 4-5, replacing "forming" with "attaching" in line 6, "starting on the one electrolyzing electrode side" in lines 13-14, "of the valve foil metal" in line 16 and all of lines 17-19 at this stage (After Final) which will require a new search at this stage, Further the new matter issue raised in the previous rejection has not been addressed.

SP 2014

LONG PHAM PRIMARY EXAMINER